

protection due to local budget constraints.

As long as I am in Congress, I will continue to do all that I can to work closely with law enforcement officials, not just talking with them and patting them on the back, so they have adequate resources to protect themselves while patrolling our streets.

I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of this bipartisan legislation that will help improve the protection of our law enforcement officials.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for my closing remarks.

First, I would like to recognize the distinguished Senator from Vermont, PATRICK LEAHY, as being very, very influential in developing the measure before us under discussion now.

In closing, I note that we expect our law enforcement officers to protect those who are unable to protect themselves. But to do so, however, we must ensure that these brave men and women are themselves protected.

In 2012, for example, armor-resistant vests were credited with saving the lives of 33 law enforcement officers in 20 different States. Fourteen of those vests were purchased with the help of Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program funds.

In my home district in Michigan, the police departments for Highland Park, Melvindale, Romulus City, Wayne County, and others have received funds through this important program.

While some of the approximately 800,000 law enforcement officers throughout our country do have some form of bullet-resistant armor, far too many of these brave men and women are not afforded the same protection due to State and local budget constraints.

It is with great pleasure and privilege that I assure every Member of the House that S. 125 will ensure that this program continues to provide such vitally needed assistance.

I urge support for this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee, and he will close debate on our side.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, last month, a few weeks ago, Alden Clopton was on patrol after midnight. He is a deputy constable in Houston, Texas. He works for the constable's office at Precinct 7.

Constables are just like deputy sheriffs and police officers. They have all the power under the State of Texas laws as any other police officer.

He was on routine patrol with his rookie partner trainee, Ann Glasgow, and they made a traffic stop in a tough part of town in Houston, Texas. As the

investigation is taking place, Mr. Speaker, some outlaw snuck up behind Alden Clopton and pulled out a pistol and shot at him six times in the back.

Some of those bullets made their mark and some of those bullets missed. He owes his life, he says, to the bulletproof vest that he was wearing. Constable May Walker, a constable at Precinct 7, said he survived because he was wearing a vest.

□ 1745

You may have never heard of Alden Clopton, but he is a peace officer who comes from a peace officer family. His wife is a deputy sheriff; his three brothers are all in law enforcement; and his son is a cop in Mississippi, I believe. He lives today because he had a bulletproof vest on. As the ranking member has said and as the chairman has said, we owe it to peace officers to protect them when they go out in society and do society's dirty work for us—to protect and serve us.

This week is National Police Week. We honor our police officers—those who protect us, those who work the thin blue line to protect us from those who would do us harm. This is an appropriate piece of legislation to show peace officers like Alden Clopton and all of those throughout the country that we have their backs—that we support them—and that Congress is going to do what is necessary to protect them while they protect us.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate counterpart to my legislation, H.R. 228, that will reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act, comes during a momentous week in law enforcement—National Police Week, starting this Sunday.

Thank you, as well, to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, for working with me on this legislation since its original passage in 1999.

Recent tragic events highlight the threats our men and women in uniform face each day.

However, these all-important vests cannot protect the lives of those who do not have access to them.

Now more than ever, it is imperative that we give law enforcement the tools they need so they may do their jobs and carry out their duties safely and effectively.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership program is one of those critical tools.

In fact, we know from some of the most recent statistics, that 14 of 33 officers saved by bulletproof vests, were purchased using funds from the Bulletproof Vest Partnership program.

Since 1999, over 13,000 jurisdictions across the country have participated in the BVP program.

I encourage those law enforcement officials and concerned citizens listening, especially those in South Jersey, to apply for this vital program.

The deadline to do so, May 16th, is quickly approaching.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 125.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SELF-DEFENSE AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2137) to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2137

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act of 2015”.

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Too often, Federal law enforcement officers encounter potentially violent criminals, placing officers in danger of grave physical harm.

(2) In 2012 alone, 1,857 Federal law enforcement officers were assaulted, with 206 sustaining serious injuries.

(3) From 2008 through 2011, an additional 8,587 Federal law enforcement officers were assaulted.

(4) Federal law enforcement officers remain a target even when they are off-duty. Over the past 3 years, 27 law enforcement officers have been killed off-duty.

(5) It is essential that law enforcement officers are able to defend themselves, so they can carry out their critical missions and ensure their own personal safety and the safety of their families whether on-duty or off-duty.

(6) These dangers to law enforcement officers continue to exist during a covered furlough.

## SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “agency” means each authority of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States;

(2) the term “covered Federal law enforcement officer” means any individual who—

(A) is an employee of an agency;

(B) has the authority to make arrests or apprehensions for, or prosecute, violations of Federal law; and

(C) on the day before the date on which the applicable covered furlough begins, is authorized by the agency employing the individual to carry a firearm in the course of official duties;

(3) the term “covered furlough” means a planned event by an agency during which employees are involuntarily furloughed due to downsizing, reduced funding, lack of work, or any budget situation including a lapse in appropriations; and

(4) the term “firearm” has the meaning given that term in section 921 of title 18, United States Code.

## SEC. 4. PROTECTING FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO ARE SUBJECTED TO A COVERED FURLOUGH.

During a covered furlough, a covered Federal law enforcement officer shall have the

same rights to carry a firearm issued by the Federal Government as if the covered furlough was not in effect, including, if authorized on the day before the date on which the covered furlough begins, the right to carry a concealed firearm, if the sole reason the covered Federal law enforcement officer was placed on leave was due to the covered furlough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 2137, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we honor our law enforcement heroes for the annual Police Week, I rise in support of H.R. 2137, the Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act of 2015.

Federal law enforcement officers face potentially dangerous situations on a daily basis whether they are on duty or off duty. Accordingly, they are permitted to carry their government-issued firearms on their persons even when they are not on duty. However, during the 2013 government shutdown, at least three Federal agencies forbade their law enforcement officers from carrying their government-issued firearms or credentials during the furlough. This decision potentially endangered these officers' lives by putting them at an unnecessary risk. Further, it prevented these highly trained officers from being able to respond to a critical incident or threat.

The Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act will ensure that officers are able to defend and protect themselves on and off duty by allowing all covered Federal law enforcement officers to continue to carry their government-issued firearms during a furlough or a government shutdown. Allowing our highly trained and experienced Federal law enforcement officers to carry their firearms during a furlough not only ensures their safety and protection, but the safety and protection of their families and those around them.

As we honor our Nation's law enforcement officers this week during the annual National Police Week, let's ensure that the brave men and women of the Federal law enforcement community have the capability to defend themselves and others and to respond to threatening situations even in a time of furlough.

I thank the bill's sponsor, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, for his work on this

important measure, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Members of the House, I rise in support of H.R. 2137, the Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act.

This bill would authorize Federal law enforcement officers to carry their government-issued firearms during government shutdowns and administrative furloughs that result from lapses in appropriations. Essentially, this measure would help ensure that those who protect us are able to continue to do so even during an official furlough. The ability of our Federal law enforcement officers to respond to critical incidents should not be impeded, particularly when violent crimes are committed in their presence.

H.R. 2137 does not expand Federal law enforcement officers' authority to carry firearms. The bill merely authorizes these officers to continue to carry their federally issued firearms as if a furlough had not occurred. This legislation recognizes the very real threat of harm that many of our officers face, particularly special agents, on a regular basis—a threat that does not simply disappear because of a government shutdown.

In 2012, for example, more than 1,800 Federal law enforcement officers were assaulted and, of those, approximately 200 sustained serious injuries. Even when off duty, Federal law enforcement officers remain the target of assault. For example, between 2011 and 2014, 27 law enforcement officers were killed while they were off duty.

Although this legislation only concerns Federal officers, I want to take a moment to recognize the State, local, and Federal officers who have sacrificed their lives in serving our communities.

This week, law enforcement officers throughout the United States have come to Washington to show their support for our fallen officers during National Police Week. In the spirit of National Police Week, it is vitally important that our Federal officers are able to protect people in our communities, themselves, and their family members from the continuing threats they encounter. Given the fact that H.R. 2137 facilitates this critical goal, I am eager to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise today in support of H.R. 2137, the Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS for their

support of this legislation and for their commitment to getting it to the floor today. With their support, H.R. 2137 passed the Judiciary Committee on a voice vote.

I also thank my friends, Congresswoman GABBARD from Hawaii, Congressman REICHERT from Washington, and Congressman PASCRELL from New Jersey, for joining me in introducing H.R. 2137 and for their strong support of this bill.

Finally, I thank Senator TOOMEY for introducing the companion legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this legislation to provide better protections for law enforcement officers, and I am glad to see that it is moving forward. It is particularly fitting that we consider this bill this week during National Police Week. Thousands of law enforcement officers are here from all over the country to commemorate their partners who have fallen in the line of duty and to recognize their sacrifices and contributions. I thank them for their service.

This is also a special week for this Congressman from the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia because I am a proud son of a Georgia State trooper. I know firsthand how hard they work and of the sacrifices they make in their time away from their families. He made sure that my brother and I had all of the chances at life that he had. I thank him because I know when he was off duty, as I was growing up, he was no less concerned about protecting the community. The dangers that were associated with his job didn't stop just because he came home to us. I think this holds true for all law enforcement officers.

Our law enforcement officers are highly trained and they are well aware of the responsibilities that are associated with their jobs. In light of that training and of the dangers faced by officers, Federal law enforcement officers are typically allowed to carry their firearms 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. It just seems like common sense. Federal law enforcement officers don't cease to be officers when they are off duty. Crime doesn't stop simply because an officer isn't working on a particular day. The Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act recognizes that and takes important steps to ensure that law enforcement officers can better protect themselves.

In 2013, during the Federal Government shutdown, at least three Federal agencies determined that the Antideficiency Act required them to forbid their law enforcement officers from carrying their agency-issued firearms or their personally owned firearms that were authorized by the agency. This interpretation of the law meant that at least 1,800 officers were disarmed.

During this time, there were reports confirming that at least one disarmed Federal law enforcement officer was

attacked while off duty. Fortunately, she was able to get away unharmed, but the incident highlights the real dangers that officers face even while off duty. In fact, in 2012 alone, more than 1,800 Federal officers were assaulted with 206 of them having sustained serious injuries. From 2008 to 2011, more than 8,500 Federal law enforcement officers were assaulted; and in the last 3 years, 27 Federal law enforcement officers have been killed while off duty.

The threats and dangers are real. That is why, at a minimum, we should ensure that the policies to protect law enforcement officers are clear and consistent. However, there are reports that officers were disarmed inconsistently at other agencies. It is clear that the policies varied by agency. This level of inconsistency does not make sense, just as the policy to disarm officers doesn't make sense.

H.R. 2137 ensures that it is clear that Federal law enforcement officers can carry their weapons in the event of a lapse of appropriations or of an administrative furlough. Under the bill, officers retain the right to carry their government-issued firearms for personal protection or to respond to a critical incident.

Importantly, this bill does not protect those who are on administrative leave or those who have lost the right to carry. It does not expand firearms carry authority to law enforcement officers who do not currently possess it, but it does ensure that there is a consistent policy for those officers who are able to carry and who are furloughed through no fault of their own.

The legislation is narrowly tailored, but it has a large impact. H.R. 2137 recognizes that Federal officers could be confronted by job-related threats whether they are on duty or off. It recognizes that officers need to be able to protect themselves, their families, and their communities. This bill is a bipartisan agreement that protects our law enforcement officers, who put their lives on the line to protect us, and it makes sure that it is a priority. This bill is supported by the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Association of Police Organizations.

H.R. 2137 is a sign of the recognition that we must do everything in our power to ensure that law enforcement officers have access to the tools they need to protect themselves and the public. Speaking also as a State trooper's kid, it reminds me that my dad, for all that he did in the 30-plus years that he worked, was on duty when he was not on duty. This is simply a recognition that all of our officers carry that same trust, and we want to give them the tools to do what they need to do.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the authors of this legislation, as well as the

previous speaker, my friend, for his articulation of this bill, and I thank all of the Members who are on the floor joining in support of H.R. 2137, the Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act of 2015. I thank Mr. CONYERS, the ranking member, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me express my recognition and appreciation of the thousands of families who will come to honor those police officers who have fallen in duty—many of them, their loved ones. We honor law enforcement officers who gave their lives in the line of duty. The loss of one officer's life is one too many. In considering the myriad of dangers our officers face, we must ensure they have the appropriate authority to protect our communities and themselves.

I support this legislation because it will make it clear that the brave Federal law enforcement officers who protect us will not be forced to lock away their government-issued firearms in the event of official furloughs, such as those occasioned by government shutdowns.

□ 1800

Our Federal law enforcement officers must be prepared to respond to numerous threats faced each day by our country, and this bill will help them do so without expanding any existing authority or creating new ones.

This bill ensures our Federal law enforcement agencies uniformly provide our special agents and other law enforcement officers with the necessary support to respond to critical incidents.

Our officers are highly trained and understand the importance associated with possessing government-issued weapons.

Let me conclude my remarks by again expressing my appreciation to the authors and the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee.

I look forward as we move forward on legislation such as the Law Enforcement Integrity Act. We want to continue to give our police officers the skills and tools to be able to do the work that they love, and that is protecting the men and women of this Nation.

Again, I offer my appreciation, respect, and sympathy as we honor those who have fallen in duty to all of their families.

I ask support for H.R. 2137.

I wish to express my full support for the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015.

I am a cosponsor of the House version of this bill, and I support adoption of this Senate-passed bill so that we can send it to the President for signature.

In an effort to keep our citizens safe, law enforcement and correctional officers put their lives on the line each day, in every state and territory of the United States.

Gun violence poses a lethal threat to all of us, and our law enforcement officers are often particularly at risk while protecting us.

Reauthorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program will provide our officers with needed protection when they come face-to-face with individuals who seek to do harm to the officers and others.

Last year, 42 law enforcement officers were killed by gunfire.

Seventeen law enforcement officers have already been killed by gunfire this year.

In some instances, greater availability of protective vests may have saved the lives of these officers.

This program not only promotes the purchase of protective vests and body armor, but it also encourages officers to protect themselves by wearing the equipment.

In order to receive funds, grantee jurisdictions must certify during the application process that they have a mandatory wear policy.

This requirement ensures that all uniformed patrol officers in a grantee jurisdiction will wear protective vests or body armor while on duty.

Each vest purchased through the program must pass strict performance standards set by the National Institute of Justice.

The program also gives special consideration to jurisdictions with fewer than 100,000 residents.

Without these grants, small jurisdictions might not be able to include this life-saving equipment in their budgets—leaving officers vulnerable to the daily dangers of policing.

Last year, in my district, the Houston Community College Police Department received \$8,260.45 from the BVP program, enabling the purchase of 24 protective vests.

And the Jacinto City Police Department was able to purchase 7 armor vests with \$2,135.90 received through the BVP program.

The state of Texas received a total of \$1,090,175.60 in matching funds from this program in 2015, which made the purchase of 2,834 new protective vests possible.

Since its inception in 1999, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program has helped provide more than 1 million vests as of December 2014, to law enforcement officers in more than 13,000 jurisdictions.

The number of women in law enforcement continues to grow.

Yet much of the protective armor currently offered is primarily designed for male officers.

To be certain female officers receive the same level of protection as their male counterparts, the BVP program gives priority to jurisdictions that provide uniquely-fitted vests, including protective vests that conform anatomically to females.

From conducting traffic stops to responding to domestic violence calls, our law enforcement officers often face extreme danger.

Those dangers are evidenced this week—National Police Week—as we honor the brave men and women who gave their lives to protect us and our communities.

As we honor our law enforcement officers during National Police Week, with particular recognition for the sacrifice of fallen officers and their families, it is fitting that we complete work on this legislation today so that it may become law.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support S. 125.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 2137.

I thank Representative DOUG COLINS. This is a good, gutsy bill. I thank my co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, Representative DAVE REICHERT, who is always there for every law enforcement person in this country, regardless of which level that law enforcement officer serves, be it Federal, state, county, or local, and Representative TULSI GABBARD for introducing this bipartisan legislation.

Federal law enforcement officers risk their own safety to make our communities safer every day. We need to make sure that they have the tools they need to do the job.

Law enforcement officers were ordered—and you have heard this before—to lock up their government-issued weapons and were prohibited from carrying their government-issued credentials while carrying their personally owned weapon during the last government shutdown.

This decision potentially endangered one female agent. We just heard that described. Thankfully, she was able to deescalate the situation and walk away unharmed.

This incident serves as a reminder that criminals don't care if Federal officers are furloughed, and it highlights the very real need to ensure that law enforcement officers have the means to protect themselves regardless of their duty status.

This bill will allow the brave members of the Federal law enforcement community to have the capability to defend themselves and respond to threatening situations even in a time when they are off or furloughed.

I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for my concluding remarks.

Members of the House, in 2004, Congress, in recognition of the serious dangers faced by the Federal law enforcement officers, passed the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act, which authorizes Federal law enforcement officers to carry concealed weapons in any jurisdiction in the United States.

Passage of H.R. 2137 would ensure that, when appropriations lapse or another government shutdown occurs, which we hope it won't, Federal law enforcement officers authorized to carry firearms will continue to be able to carry their government-issued firearms throughout the shutdown's duration for personal protection and to respond to critical incidents.

I urge support for this bill. I thank all of the Members who contributed to it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it and support our law enforcement officers.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we honor police week, I rise in support of another common sense bill that would benefit the men and women who serve our nation in federal law enforcement.

The Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act is a simple bill, it allows a federal law enforcement officer to carry their government issued firearm during a furlough in the same way that they could carry their weapon if there was no furlough.

The risks that federal law enforcement officials face are the same whether or not they are on furlough or not. Some federal law enforcement officials have even been specifically targeted because of their positions.

These brave men and women should not be put in jeopardy due to a budget shortfall or an inability to pass a budget. The risks they face are the same, they have the right to defend themselves.

I thank Rep. COLLINS for bringing this bill forward, and I urge your support today.

That's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2137.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOVERING MISSING CHILDREN ACT

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3209) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the disclosure of certain tax return information for the purpose of missing or exploited children investigations, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3209

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Recovering Missing Children Act".*

#### SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN RETURN INFORMATION RELATING TO MISSING OR EXPLOITED CHILDREN INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 6103(i)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by inserting "or pertaining to the case of a missing or exploited child," after "may be a party," in subparagraph (A)(i),

(2) by inserting "or to such a case of a missing or exploited child," after "may be a party," in subparagraph (A)(iii), and

(3) by inserting "(or any criminal investigation or proceeding, in the case of a matter relating to a missing or exploited child)" after "concerning such act" in subparagraph (B)(iii).

(b) *DISCLOSURE TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 6103(i)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) *DISCLOSURE TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IN THE CASE OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO A MISSING OR EXPLOITED CHILD.*—

"(i) *IN GENERAL.*—In the case of an investigation pertaining to a missing or exploited child,

the head of any Federal agency, or his designee, may disclose any return or return information obtained under subparagraph (A) to officers and employees of any State or local law enforcement agency, but only if—

"(I) such State or local law enforcement agency is part of a team with the Federal agency in such investigation, and

"(II) such information is disclosed only to such officers and employees who are personally and directly engaged in such investigation.

"(ii) *LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION.*—Information disclosed under this subparagraph shall be solely for the use of such officers and employees in locating the missing child, in a grand jury proceeding, or in any preparation for, or investigation which may result in, a judicial or administrative proceeding.

"(iii) *MISSING CHILD.*—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'missing child' shall have the meaning given such term by section 403 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5772).

"(iv) *EXPLOITED CHILD.*—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'exploited child' means a minor with respect to whom there is reason to believe that a specified offense against a minor (as defined by section 111(7) of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911(7))) has or is occurring."

#### (2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 6103(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking "subsection (i)(7)(A)" and inserting "subsection (i)(1)(C) or (7)(A)".

(B) Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended by striking "(i)(3)(B)(i)" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting "(i)(1)(C), (3)(B)(i),".

(C) Section 7213(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking "(i)(3)(B)(i)" and inserting "(i)(1)(C), (3)(B)(i),".

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3209, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this week we have thousands of members of the law enforcement community here in Washington to celebrate Police Week.

Every day police officers throughout our country wear the uniform with pride, and they understand the tremendous responsibility that comes with it, putting the safety of others before the safety of themselves.

They protect us, they protect our families, and they protect our neighborhoods. We owe it to these police officers to give them every reasonable